

1 IGNACIA S. MORENO  
2 Assistant Attorney General  
3 Environmental and Natural Resources Division  
4 U.S. Department of Justice  
5 PATRICIA L. HURST  
Trial Attorney, Environmental Enforcement Section  
P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044  
(202) 307-1242 (telephone); (202) 514-2583 (facsimile)  
Patricia.Hurst@usdoj.gov

6 MELINDA HAAG  
7 United States Attorney  
Northern District of California  
8 CHARLES O'CONNOR (SBN 56320)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
9 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94102  
10 (415) 436-7200 (telephone); (415) 436-7221 (facsimile)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff United States of America

(Additional Attorneys Listed on Signature Page)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ,

No. 4:09-CV-05684-RS

Plaintiff,

STIPULATION AND [REDACTED]  
ORDER EXTENDING STAY

20 CITY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,

## Defendants.

22

R, Intervenor-

22 BAYKEEPER, INC., d/b/a SAN FRANCISCO  
23 BAYKEEPER, Intervenor-Plaintiff.

## STIPULATION

25 Whereas, this action is a civil action brought by the United States of America ("United  
26 States") on behalf of the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA")  
27 pursuant to section 309 of the Clean Water Act ("CWA"), 33 U.S.C. § 1319, against the cities of  
28 Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont, and the Stege Sanitary District

1 ("Defendants") to require compliance with CWA standards, limitations, and orders prohibiting  
2 discharge of sewage without CWA permit authorization;

3 Whereas, the State of California ex rel. California State Water Resources Control Board  
4 ("State Water Board") and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco  
5 Bay Region ("Regional Water Board") (collectively, "Water Boards"), are joined as "a Section  
6 309(e) party" -- a party (neither plaintiff nor defendant at this time) in accordance with Section  
7 309(e) of the CWA, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(e), but intend to re-align as a plaintiff through motion or  
8 in a future amendment to the United States' complaint to add State law claims as part of  
9 settlement of this action;

10 Whereas, Defendants have not yet been served with the United States' complaint;

11 Whereas, Baykeeper, Inc. ("Baykeeper") has moved to intervene as a Plaintiff in this  
12 matter, which motion to intervene was granted by this Court in an Order dated January 22, 2010;

13 Whereas, the Order and Baykeeper's Motion to Intervene was challenged by the  
14 Defendants' Joint Opposition to Motion to Intervene and supporting declarations ("Joint  
15 Opposition") filed January 29, 2010, but the parties came to agreement and filed a Stipulation to  
16 Withdraw Intervention Opposition, Accept Service, and Limit Claims in Intervention on August  
17 26, 2010, and this Court entered its Order thereon on August 27, 2010;

18 Whereas this Court previously granted a stay of litigation and all litigation timelines and  
19 deadlines on February 10, 2010, which was further extended to and including October 8, 2010 by  
20 an Order dated May 26, 2010;

21 Whereas all parties need additional time to negotiate, exchange information, and finalize  
22 terms; keeping the parties informed will promote productive and timely settlement discussions;  
23 and the participation of all parties is useful towards settlement;

24 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED THAT:

25 1. The stay previously granted is hereby extended to and including March 1, 2011,  
26 under the terms and conditions set forth herein. Except as stipulated in Paragraph 2,  
27 below, all litigation activity shall continue to be stayed in *United States v. City of*  
28

Alameda, et al., USDC N.D. Cal. Case No. CV 09-05684 CW to and including March 1, 2011.

- a. No party will file motions or initiate discovery.
- b. The time for the United States to serve its summons and complaint will be tolled while the stay is in effect.
- c. The time for Defendants to respond in any way to Baykeeper's complaint in intervention will be tolled while the stay is in effect, and Defendants preserve all options and arguments for any response to Baykeeper's complaint in intervention.

Between October 8, 2010 and March 1, 2011, the Water Boards may either move to align as a plaintiff and to add State law claims, or file with the United States plaintiff a single amended complaint to add the State law claims, if they so choose. The time for Defendants to receive summons and complaint as well as to respond in any way to Plaintiffs' complaint remains tolled while the stay is in effect.

Until a new Scheduling Conference is scheduled after March 1, 2011, the parties will not hold their Conference under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and will not make disclosures under Rule 26(a).

This Stipulation will not be considered a general appearance by the Defendants. Baykeeper shall continue to have the right to participate in negotiations with the United States, Water Boards, and the Defendants regarding the Stipulated Order for Preliminary Relief. During the stay period, Baykeeper shall receive copies of any documents or plans due under the current Administrative Orders issued to Defendants or about November 18, 2009, and shall have the opportunity to comment on those documents and plans.

6. This Stay may be extended by stipulation of the parties, and further order of the Court, if the settlement negotiations regarding the Stipulated Order for Preliminary Relief are continuing.

Dated: September 1, 2010

Patricia Hurst  
United States Department of Justice  
For Plaintiff United States


John Davidson  
California Attorney General's Office  
For State of California, ex rel. California State Water Resources Control Board and California  
Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region


Jason Flanders  
San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc.  
For Intervenor-Plaintiff

Ellen J. Garber  
Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP, and  
Teresa L. Highsmith, City Attorney  
For Defendant City of Alameda  
(specially appearing without waiving  
service of complaint)

Zach Cowan  
City Attorneys  
For Defendant City of Berkeley  
(specially appearing without waiving  
service of complaint)

1   
2 Michael G. Biddle  
3 City Attorneys  
4 For Defendant City of Emeryville  
5 (specially appearing without waiving  
6 service of complaint)

7   
8 Michelle Kenyon  
9 City Attorney  
10 For Defendant City of Piedmont  
11 (specially appearing without waiving  
12 service of complaint)

13   
14 Kenton L. Alm  
15 Meyers Nave Riback Silver & Wilson  
16 Attorneys for Defendant Stege Sanitary District  
17 and Defendant City of Albany  
18 (specially appearing without waiving  
19 service of complaint)

20   
21 Marilee J. Allan  
22 Bingham McCutchen LLP  
23 Attorneys for Defendant City of Oakland  
24 (specially appearing without waiving  
25 service of complaint)

26  
27  
28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

*RS*  
[PROPOSED] ORDER

9

10

11

12 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

13



14

15 U.S. District Court Judge

9-7-10

16 Date

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28